

EXHIBIT NO. DX-1 evid.
CAUSE NO. 3:22cv 134-DPJ-HSO-LHS
WITNESS _____
CLERK: SHONE POWELL

FEB 26 2024

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
Candice Cane, REPORTER

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
NORTHERN DIVISION**

MISSISSIPPI STATE CONFERENCE OF THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE; DR.
ANDREA WESLEY; DR. JOSEPH WESLEY;
ROBERT EVANS; GARY FREDERICKS; PAMELA
HAMNER; BARBARA FINN; OTHO BARNES;
SHIRLINDA ROBERTSON; SANDRA SMITH;
DEBORAH HULITT; RODESTA TUMBLIN; DR.
KIA JONES; ANGELA GRAYSON; MARCELEAN
ARRINGTON; VICTORIA ROBERTSON,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

STATE BOARD OF ELECTION
COMMISSIONERS; TATE REEVES, *in his official
capacity as Governor of Mississippi*; LYNN FITCH, *in
her official capacity as Attorney General of
Mississippi*; MICHAEL WATSON, *in his official
capacity as Secretary of State of Mississippi*,

Defendants,

AND

MISSISSIPPI REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE,

Intervenor-Defendant.

**Case No. 3:22-cv-734-DJP-HSL-LHS-
FKB**

EXPERT REPORT OF JOHN R. ALFORD, Ph.D.

October 16, 2023

**EXHIBIT
DX-1**

DX-001-001

SCOPE OF INQUIRY

I have been retained by counsel for the defendants, as an expert to provide analysis related to *Gingles* prongs 2 and 3, and racially polarized voting in the above-entitled action, which is a challenge to the most recently adopted state legislative district maps for the State of Mississippi. I have been asked by counsel to examine and respond to the report provided by the plaintiffs' expert, Dr. Lisa Handley, and the associated data and materials provided in disclosure. My rate of compensation in this matter is \$600 per hour and my compensation does not depend on the outcome of this lawsuit.

SUMMARY

The election analysis provided by Dr. Handley shows that Black and White voters provide very different levels of support for Republican and Democratic candidates. The election analysis does not show the same pattern in response to variation in the race of the candidates. The high cohesion demonstrated by Black voters in these elections is not a function of Black voters coalescing around Black candidates but rather is a function of cohesive Black voter preferences for Democratic party candidates. Similarly, the tendency of White voters to vote cohesively against Democratic candidates is not reserved for opposition to Black Democratic candidates but is instead cohesive support for Republican candidates whether the Democratic candidate is White or Black.

QUALIFICATIONS

I am a tenured full professor of political science at Rice University. In my over thirty-five years at Rice University, I have taught courses on redistricting, elections, political representation, voting behavior, and statistical methods at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. I am the author of numerous scholarly works on political behavior. These works have appeared in academic journals such as the *American Journal of Political Science*, *Journal of Politics*, *Science*, *Annual Review of Political Science*, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, *Annals of the American Academy of*

Political and Social Science, Political Psychology, and Political Research Quarterly.

Over the last thirty-five years, I have worked with numerous local governments on districting plans and on Voting Rights Act issues. I have previously provided expert reports and/or testified as an expert witness in voting rights and statistical issues in a variety of court cases in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wisconsin. The details of my academic background, including all publications in the last ten years, and my work as an expert, including all cases in which I have testified by deposition or at trial in the last four years, are covered in the attached CV (Appendix A).

DATA AND SOURCES

In preparing my report, I have reviewed the reports filed by the plaintiffs' expert Dr. Lisa Handley. I have also relied for my report on the analysis, the associated documentation, and the data provided to date by Dr. Handley.

METHODS

Dr. Handley and I both utilize the statistical technique of Ecological Inference (EI), developed originally by Professor Gary King.¹ EI is a more efficient technique intended specifically to improve on ecological regression (ER), the analysis technique previously used in VRA lawsuits to assess voter cohesion and polarization. In a nutshell, traditional ecological regression is a mathematical technique for estimating the single best fitting straight line that could be drawn to describe the relationship between two variables in a scatter plot. Applied to voting rights cases, the logic of ecological regression analysis is to determine to what degree, if any, the vote for a candidate increases in a linear fashion as the concentration of voters of a given ethnicity in the precincts increases. In contrast, King's EI procedure utilizes a method of bounds analysis, combined with a more traditional statistical method, to improve on standard ecological regression.

¹ King, Gary. (1997). *A Solution to the Ecological Inference Problem*. Princeton Univ. Press.

While the details are mathematically complex, the differences mostly center on utilizing deterministic bounds information contained in individual precinct results that would not be exploited in ecological regression. In addition, EI relaxes the linear constraint that a traditional ecological regression analysis would impose on the pattern across precincts. This combination in EI of relaxing some assumptions and utilizing more information typically yields a more efficient estimation of cohesion and polarization when compared to standard ecological regression, although in many cases the results from EI are not substantively different than ER results for the same election data.

In its original form, King's EI could only be used to estimate voter support when there were two racial groups (e.g., White and Black) and two candidates, hence the label "2 x 2 EI" often applied to the original form. Often there are more than two racial groups (e.g., White, Black, and Latino), or more than two possible vote choices. To accommodate these situations, one would have to run an independent 2 x 2 EI analysis for each race of interest and for each candidate of interest (and for the no voting category), an approach suggested by King and labeled the 'iterative' approach to "R x C" (Rows by Columns) estimation.

Shortly after suggesting the iterative method, King published a more advanced theoretical approach to R x C estimation using a Multinomial-Dirichlet Bayesian technique. A fully Bayesian implementation of this approach was viewed by King and his coauthors as computationally impractical, given that it could take as long as a week or more to run a single model on the computers available at that time, and they provided instead an implementation that relied on nonlinear least-squares.² Finally, in 2007 Lau and colleagues, taking advantage of advancements in computing technology, implemented the fully Bayesian estimation procedure outline by King, et al and provided a software module called "eiPack" that included the module 'ei.MD.bayes' that

² See Rosen, Jiang, King, and Tanner., *Bayesian and Frequentist Inference for Ecological Inference: The R x C Case*. 55 STATISTICA NEERLANDICA 134 (2001).

allowed for the estimation of the true Bayesian approach.³ This is the implementation of EI R x C that I have relied on here, and is also one of the techniques relied on by Dr. Handley for her analysis in this case.⁴

ELECTION ANALYSIS

I began my analysis with an attempt to replicate selected results of the RxC Ecological Inference (EI) analysis provided by Dr. Handley in this case, using the election and voter data she provided. My replication results matched very closely with the EI RxC estimates in Dr. Handley's report. To illustrate this, I provide below in Table 1 both my EI RxC estimates, and Dr. Handley's EI RxC estimates for the three judicial contests that she included in Appendix D of her report

Table 1: Replication of Handley EI RxC Analysis for Judicial Contests from Handley's Appendix D

Contest	Year	Candidate		Black Voters				White Voters			
				Handley Appendix D EI RxC	Replication			Handley Appendix D EI RxC	Replication		
		Name	Race		EI RxC	Low CI	Hi CI		EI RxC	Low CI	Hi CI
Supreme Court Central P1	2012	Banks	B	83.3%	83.4%	82.1%	84.6%	8.7%	8.8%	7.6%	10.0%
Supreme Court Central P1	2012	Waller	W	16.7%	16.6%	15.4%	17.9%	91.3%	91.2%	90.0%	92.4%
Supreme Court Southern P2	2016	Beam	W	52.5%	52.5%	50.2%	54.8%	72.4%	72.4%	71.6%	73.2%
Supreme Court Southern P2	2016	Shareef	B	47.5%	47.5%	45.2%	49.8%	27.6%	27.6%	26.8%	28.4%
Supreme Court Central P1	2020	Griffis	W	8.2%	8.1%	7.1%	9.3%	92.2%	92.4%	90.6%	94.1%
Supreme Court Central P1	2020	Westbrook	B	91.8%	91.9%	90.7%	92.9%	7.8%	7.6%	5.9%	9.4%

My replication results match the RxC estimates reported by Dr. Handley very closely, with only the slight variation, typically only one-tenth of one percentage point, that one would expect given the inherent variation associated with EI estimation. Because I am able to replicate her EI RxC results, and to avoid the implication that the differences in our conclusions stem from methodological differences, I rely on the various numerical EI RxC results included in her report and appendices for my discussion throughout this report.

³ See Lau, Olivia, Ryan T. Moore, and Michael Kellermann. "eiPack: Ecological Inference and Higher-Dimension Data Management," R News. vol.7, no. 2 (October 2007).

⁴ The data programing required for the EI RxC analysis for this report was performed by my Rice colleague Dr. Randy Stevenson under my direction and control.

A. A Comparison of Three Presidential Elections

In Table 2 below, I report the results for the three most recent presidential elections. For an overview of voter polarization, November presidential elections are a good place to start. These elections are typically competitive, the same two candidates compete in every precinct, and the analysis is not affected by local voting effects where votes for one candidate in a state or local election might be boosted by ‘friends and neighbors voting’. The EI RxC estimates in Table 2 are averages of the estimates across Dr. Handley’s seven areas of interest. The individual estimates for each of the seven areas are included in her report as Appendix A1 through Appendix A7.

**Table 2: Presidential Election Results Report –
Averages of EI RxC Estimates across Handley’s Seven Areas of Interest**

Date	Contest	Candidate Name	Party	Race	% Black Support	% White Support
Nov. 2012	President	Obama/Biden	D	B/W	97.0	6.7
		Romney/Ryan	R	W/W	2.4	92.8
Nov. 2016	President	Clinton/Kaine	D	W/W	96.8	5.5
		Trump/Pence	R	W/W	2.3	93.6
Nov. 2020	President	Biden/Harris	D	W/B	96.6	7.4
		Trump/Pence	R	W/W	2.6	92.0

The 2012 contest includes a Black Democrat running against a White Republican. The 2020 contest represents an intermediate type, which Dr. Handley includes in her analysis of racially contested elections because, while the presidential candidates were both White, the Democratic vice-presidential candidate, Kamala Harris, was Black. The 2016 contest completes the pattern, with a White Democrat running against a White Republican at both the presidential and vice-presidential level. If the race of candidates is a focus for Black voters, then we would expect a clear ordering with Black voter support highest for the 2012 Obama/Biden ticket, lowest for the 2016 Clinton/Kaine ticket, and somewhere in between for the 2020 Biden/Harris ticket. Similarly, if the race of candidates is a focus for White voters, then we would expect White voter support to follow the reverse ordering, with White opposition to the all-White 2016 Clinton/Kaine

ticket the lowest and White opposition to the Black-led 2012 Obama/Biden ticket the highest.

Looking first at the estimates for Black voters we can see that in all three elections the Democratic ticket gets a similarly high level of support, with only very modest variation, and in fact all three estimates round to 97 percent. Turning to the estimated voting behavior of White voters, we can see that in all three elections the Democratic ticket gets a similarly low level of support, with only very modest variation. The lowest estimated support, at 5.5%, is for the all-White 2016 Clinton/Kaine ticket, and the highest estimate of White support for the Democratic ticket is 7.4% for the 2020 Biden/Harris ticket, followed closely by the 2012 Obama/Biden ticket at 6.7%. In short, Black and White voters do appear to offer very different levels of support to Democratic and Republican candidates, but there is virtually no difference in the levels of support when we turn the focus to the mix of Black and White candidates in these two-party contested presidential elections, and what slight differences exist do not fall in the order we would expect if concerns for the race of the candidates was driving the behavior of either Black or White voters in these contests.

B. All of Dr. Handley's Statewide General Elections

In Appendix A1 through Appendix A7 to her report in this case dated August 28, 2023, Dr. Handley provides results from an EI analysis for 17 statewide contests analyzed within each of her seven geographically defined areas of interest. According to her report, she selected all 12 racially contested elections in the years from 2011 to 2020 based on the additional probative value typically accorded racially contested elections, and also added five non-racial contested elections from 2016, 2018, and 2019. For ease of comparison, I have produced a summary table that aggregates Dr. Handley's RxC EI estimate across the seven areas of interest. These average estimates for Black and White voters for each of the 17 elections are reported in Table 3 below.

Table 3 shows that Black voters tend to provide cohesive support to Democratic candidates, almost always in the 90 percent range, and that White voters, in turn, support Republican

candidates, with White votes for the Republican candidates typically in the 80 to 90 percent range. This is indeed partisan polarized voting, with Black voters providing highly cohesive support to every Democratic candidate and White voters providing clearly cohesive support to every Republican candidate.

What accounts for this remarkable stability in the divergent preferences of Black and White voters across years and offices? It is clearly not Black voters' preference for Black candidates or White voters' disinclination to vote for Black candidates. At 94.3 percent, the average Black support for the 11 Black candidates identified in Dr. Handley's analysis is indeed highly cohesive, but so is slightly higher average 95.5 percent support for the five White Democratic candidates. Similarly, the average White vote for Republican candidates in opposition to the 11 Black Democrats is clearly cohesive, with only 6.9 percent of White voters crossing over to support the Black Democratic candidates, but so is the average of only 9.1 percent of White voters crossing over to support the White Democratic candidates.

Dr Handley acknowledges this fact, and notes that even this slight difference is driven largely by a single contest. On page 12 of her report, she observes that "the average percentage of White support for the Black-preferred White candidates is slightly higher than that for the Black-preferred Black candidates: 9.1% of the White voters crossed over to vote for White candidates of choice of Black voters (compared to 6.9% for the Black candidates preferred by Black voters). This was driven in large measure by support for Jim Hood in the 2019 gubernatorial general election contest – on average across the areas, 17.7% of White voters cast their votes for Hood."

Table 3: Racially Contested Statewide Elections Included in the Handley Report – Averages of EI RxC Estimates across Handley's Seven Areas of Interest

Year	Office	Candidate	Race	Party	Mean A1-A7	
					Black EI rxc	White EI rxc
2020	President	Joseph Biden/Kamala Harris	W/B	D	96.6	7.4
2020	President	Donald Trump/Michael Pence	W/W	R	2.6	92.0
2020	President	Others			0.8	0.5
2020	U.S. Senate	Mike Espy	B	D	97.0	10.5
2020	U.S. Senate	Cindy Hyde-Smith	W	R	2.2	88.6
2020	U.S. Senate	Jimmy Edwards	W	L	0.8	0.9
2019	Governor	Jim Hood	W	D	96.2	17.7
2019	Governor	Tate Reeves	W	R	3.0	81.6
2019	Governor	Others			0.9	0.7
2019	Lt. Governor	Jay Hughes	W	D	93.5	8.2
2019	Lt. Governor	Delbert Hosemann	W	R	6.5	91.8
2019	Sec. of State	Johnny DuPree	B	D	96.3	7.0
2019	Sec. of State	Michael Watson	W	R	3.7	93.0
2019	Att. General	Jennifer Riley Collins	B	D	96.3	7.7
2019	Att. General	Lynn Fitch	W	R	3.7	92.3
2019	Treasurer	Addie Lee Green	B	D	95.6	4.9
2019	Treasurer	David McRae	W	R	4.4	95.1
2019	Ins. Comm.	Robert Amos	B	D	95.5	4.6
2019	Ins. Comm.	Mike Chaney	W	R	4.5	95.4
2019	Ag. Comm.	Rickey Cole	W	D	95.9	8.0
2019	Ag. Comm.	Andy Gipson	W	R	4.1	92.0
2018	U.S. Senate	David Baria	W	D	95.0	6.2
2018	U.S. Senate	Roger Wicker	W	R	3.9	92.8
2018	U.S. Senate	Others			1.2	1.0
2018	U.S. Senate (special)	Mike Espy	B	D	92.7	7.5
2018	U.S. Senate (special)	Cindy Hyde-Smith	W	R	2.8	64.1
2018	U.S. Senate (special)	Chris McDaniel	W	R	2.0	27.7
2018	U.S. Senate (special)	Tobey Bernard Bartee	B	NP	2.4	0.7
2018	U.S. Senate (runoff)	Mike Espy	B	D	97.1	7.3
2018	U.S. Senate (runoff)	Cindy Hyde-Smith	W	R	2.9	92.7
2016	President	Hillary Clinton/Tim Kaine	W/W	D	96.8	5.5
2016	President	Donald Trump/Michael Pence	W/W	R	2.3	93.6
2016	President	Others			0.9	0.9
2015	Governor	Robert Gray	B	D	84.1	4.7
2015	Governor	Phil Bryant	W	R	14.5	94.7
2015	Governor	Shawn O'Hara	W	Ref	1.4	0.7
2015	Sec. of State	Charles Graham	B	D	90.8	6.2
2015	Sec. of State	Delbert Hosemann	W	R	6.8	92.2
2015	Sec. of State	Randy Walker		Ref	2.4	1.6
2012	President	Barack Obaman/Joe Biden	B/W	D	97.0	6.7
2012	President	Mitt Romney/Paul Ryan	W/W	R	2.4	92.8
2012	President	Others			0.5	0.5
2011	Governor	Johnny DuPree	B	D	94.8	8.6
2011	Governor	Phil Bryant	W	R	5.2	91.4

B/W Voter
Difference

Mean Black Democratic Candidates	94.5	6.9 87.6
Mean White Democratic Candidates	95.5	9.1 86.3
Black/White Candidate Difference	1.0	2.2 -1.2

Another way of summarizing polarization is to compute the difference between the White and Black voter preferences. This gap is very large at 87.6 in the 11 contests with Black Democratic candidates but is equally large at 86.3 in the five contests with White Democratic candidates. Put another way, the difference in the voting support among Black and White voters in a contest between two White candidates is highly polarized at a mean difference of 86.5% based solely on the political party affiliation of the candidates. When an election is racially contested the difference in the voting support among Black and White voters in a contest between the White Republican and the Black Democrat candidate is highly polarized at a mean difference of 87.6%. But when the racial cue is removed, and the election is between two White candidates, the mean difference between the White Republican and the Black Democrat candidate is a nearly identical 86.3%. Removing the racial cue only reduces the mean difference by about one percentage point. Whether a candidate is a Democrat or a Republican makes a huge, almost 90 percentage point, difference to Black and White voters in these elections. Whether a candidate is Black or White barely registers at only slightly above a single percentage point, and even that small difference depends, as Dr. Handley notes, on a single contest.

C. State Legislative Elections

Dr. Handley includes an analysis of voting patterns in a selection of 19 state legislative contests from 2015 and 2019. The partisan nature of the results is very similar to that discussed above in her analysis of statewide elections, with Black voters preferring Democratic candidates and White voters preferring Republican candidates. However, in these state legislative contests she only includes racially contested elections, so the sort of comparison of White and Black candidate support offered above is not possible here.

Summarizing the results for these contests Dr. Handley concludes on page 12 that “all 19 of the 2015 and 2019 state legislative elections that included both Black and White candidates were racially polarized.” However, she does not offer any explanation of what definition of racially

polarized is being applied in her report. In her earlier discussion of the statewide general elections, she offers slightly more detail when she notes on page 11 that “Black voters were cohesive in supporting their preferred candidates and White voters bloc voted against the candidates preferred by Black voters.” She goes on to restate that point as “in other words, in all 11 of the general election contests that included a Black candidate, in all seven of the areas studied, voting was consistently and starkly racially polarized.” This definition points first to the second *Gingles* prong in referencing Black voter cohesion, and then to the third *Gingles* prong in referencing White bloc voting. However, this definition lacks any indication of what level of Black support for their preferred candidate, or what level of White support for the opponent, meets her standard for cohesion. This is not an issue for her discussion of the statewide general elections, as the levels of Black and White voter cohesion in two-party contests, as seen above in Table 3, is always well above 80%.

That is not the case for the state legislative elections, where Black voter cohesion is below 80% in multiple elections. For example, in the 2015 contest in House District 39, the estimated Black share of the vote for the Democrat is 50.9% compared to 49.1% for the Republican candidate. This may establish a preferred candidate but given that a 50/50 split is the complete absence of cohesion, and that complete cohesion is a 100% unity of preference, this is simply not distinguishable from no cohesion at all. Put another way, given that absent a perfect 50/50 tie, there will by definition always be a preferred Black candidate, if simply having a preferred candidate was sufficient to establish cohesion, then the *Gingles* 2 threshold test would always be met and thus not actually constitute a threshold test at all. Turning to the third *Gingles* prong, a similar issue is present here. For example, in the 2019 contest in House District 36, the estimated White share of the vote for the Democrat is 49.2% compared to 50.8% for the Republican candidate. Again, this indicates little if any evidence of cohesion voting on the part of White voters.

While neither the courts nor the political science literature agree on a bright line standard for cohesion, applying two alternatives here is instructive. First, we could use a minimal 60% cohesion threshold for *Gingles* 2, and then look to see if White bloc voting was sufficient to defeat the cohesively

supported preferred candidate of Black voters in the election. By that standard only eight (42%) of the 19 state legislative contests are polarized. Applying a 75% cohesion standard (more cohesive than not) would reduce the number of polarized contests to six (32%) of 19 contests. By either standard, the candidate cohesively preferred by Black voters is not being defeated by White voters.

D. Primaries

Dr. Handley also analyzed voting in eight racially contested Democratic primary contests (as reported in her Appendix C). The results for those contests are reproduced below in Table 4. As Dr. Handley noted on page 12 of her report with regard to the earliest of these contests, “the 2011 gubernatorial primary and primary runoff for governor were both racially polarized. Black voters supported the Black candidate, Johnny DuPree, and White voters supported Bill Luckett in both contests.” This is what we would expect to see throughout these contests if voting was racially polarized.

However, the 2011 primary and runoff are the only polarized contests in this table. All of the more recent elections show a very different pattern. In the 2012 U.S. Senate primary contest, the preferred candidate of Black voters was one of the two White candidates, Albert Gore Jr., who was also the preferred candidate of White voters. Despite the presence of a Black candidate, Will Oatis, the two White candidates together received an estimated 82% of the Black vote and a similar 70% of the White vote. In the 2014 U.S. Senate contest, the preferred candidate of Black voters was one of the three White candidates, Travis Childers, who was also the preferred candidate of White voters. Despite the presence of a Black candidate, Bill Marcy, the three White candidates together received an estimated 86% of the Black vote and a similar 85% of the White vote.

Table 4: RxC EI Estimates from the Statewide Democratic Primaries Included in Appendix C of Dr. Handley's Report

Year	Office	Democratic Primary Candidates	Race	Actual Vote	EI rxc	
					Black	White
2019	Governor	Jim Hood	W	69.0	66.5	68.1
2019	Governor	Michael Brown	W	11.0	13.1	10.0
2019	Governor	Velesha Williams	B	6.9	6.8	5.8
2019	Governor	Robert Shuler Smith	B	6.7	7.4	6.3
2019	Governor	Others		6.4	6.2	9.7
2019	Governor	White Candidates			79.6	78.1
2019	Governor	Black candidates			14.2	12.1
2018	U.S. Senate	Howard Sherman	W	31.8	33.7	21.1
2018	U.S. Senate	David Baria	W	31.0	23.7	43.5
2018	U.S. Senate	Omeria Scott	B	24.2	29.7	17.9
2018	U.S. Senate	Others		13.0	13.0	17.6
2018	U.S. Senate	White Candidates			57.4	64.6
2015	Governor	Robert Gray	B	50.8	45.2	62.3
2015	Governor	Vicki Slater	W	30.4	30.1	28.8
2015	Governor	Valerie Smartt Short	B	18.8	24.7	8.9
2015	Governor	Black candidates			69.9	71.2
2015	Lt. Governor	Tim Johnson	W	75.8	70.0	87.4
2015	Lt. Governor	Jelani Barr	B	24.2	30.0	12.6
2014	U.S. Senate	Travis Childers	W	74.0	72.3	57.8
2014	U.S. Senate	Bill Marcy	B	12.1	13.8	14.6
2014	U.S. Senate	William Bond Compton Jr.	W	9.9	9.8	14.3
2014	U.S. Senate	Jonathan Rawl	W	4.1	4.2	13.3
2014	U.S. Senate	White Candidates			86.3	85.4
2012	U.S. Senate	Albert Gore Jr.	W	56.8	57.2	35.0
2012	U.S. Senate	Roger Weiner	W	24.4	24.4	34.8
2012	U.S. Senate	Will Oatis	B	18.8	18.4	30.3
2012	U.S. Senate	White Candidates			81.6	69.8
2011	Governor	Johnny DuPree	B	43.6	64.3	15.7
2011	Governor	Bill Lockett	W	39.2	23.8	58.5
2011	Governor	William Bond Compton Jr.	W	9.8	8.2	12.7
2011	Governor	Guy Dale Shaw	W	7.3	3.7	13.5
2011	Governor (runoff)	Johnny DuPree	B	55	85.9	18.8
2011	Governor (runoff)	Bill Lockett	W	45	14.1	81.2

In the 2015 Lt. Governor contest, the preferred candidate of Black voters was the White candidate, Tim Johnson, who received an estimated 70% of the Black vote, despite the presence

of a Black candidate, Jelani Barr. Johnson was also the preferred candidate of White voters. In the 2015 primary contest for Governor, the preferred candidate of both Black and White voters was a Black candidate, Robert Gray. There was also another Black candidate, Valerie Smartt Short, and together the two Black candidates received an estimated 70% of the Black vote. Those two Black candidates also received a similar 71% of the White vote, despite the fact that there was a White candidate on the ballot.

In the 2018 U.S. Senate primary contest, the preferred candidate of Black voters was one of the two White candidates, Howard Sherman. The preferred candidate of White voters was another White candidate, David Baria. Despite the presence of a Black candidate, Omeria Scott, the two White candidates together received an estimated 57% of the Black vote and a similar 65% of the White vote. In the 2019 U.S. primary contest for Governor, the preferred candidate of Black voters was one of the two White candidates, Jim Hood, who was also the preferred candidate of White voters. Despite the presence of two Black candidates, the two White candidates together received an estimated 80% of the Black vote and a similar 78% of the White vote.

A recent Republican primary not covered in Dr. Handley's report is also instructive. The newly drawn Mississippi House of Representatives in District 20 in Desoto County is an 81% White district. The 2023 Republican primary was racially contested with one Black candidate, Rodney Hall, and one White candidate, Charlie Hoots. Hall was the winner with 55% of the vote, and since no Democrats or independents filed for the seat, Hall will automatically be elected to the House in November. While the number of precincts in the district is too small to allow a useful EI analysis, it is clear from the results that Hall's selection was not blocked by White Republican voters.

As noted above, while the general elections show a high degree of partisan polarization, they do not indicate that the race of the candidates makes much difference at all. The results for the primaries are entirely consistent with that general election conclusion. Despite the fact that

these are all racial contested elections, the race of the candidates appears to have little, if any, systematic influence on the voting behavior of either Black or White voters.

E. Judicial Contests

Dr. Handley also includes an analysis of three selected judicial contests, all of which are racially contested. Table 1 above provides Dr. Handley's EI RxC results for those three contests. One of the three contests was not polarized, with both Black and White voters favoring the same candidate, Dawn Beam. The other two contests looked more like the statewide general elections, with Black and White voters favoring different candidates. This is clearly a very small sample with only three selected judicial contests, and a very mixed result as well. However, the implication of the analysis is further limited by the fact that the elections are not free of partisan influence. Dr. Handley asserts on page 13 that the "polarization found in two-thirds of these judicial contests cannot be explained by party simply because the election contests were nonpartisan." However, while the Mississippi state judicial election contests are nominally non-partisan, the candidates and the campaigns are certainly not non-partisan. This fact is widely acknowledged, and disputes about partisan appeals, ads, and support have been common over the last decade, including court battles over these issues. In the 2020 Place 1 Central District contest, the incumbent T. Kenneth Griffis was appointed by a Republican Governor, endorsed by the state Republican Party, and donated to and received donations from fellow Republican elected officials. His opponent, Latrice Westbrooks, was sued along with U.S. Representative Bennie Thompson in 2016 by her opponent in a Court of Appeals election contest. According to a December 1, 2016, Jackson Free Press news story:

James says her opponent violated state laws that require nonpartisan judicial races. James filed a lawsuit Monday against Latrice Westbrooks, who won the election; and Democratic U.S. Rep. Bennie Thompson, who campaigned for Westbrooks. The lawsuit says Westbrooks and Thompson "willfully and intentionally" aligned themselves politically by appearing together at events and by distributing a sample ballot recommending that people support Thompson in the U.S. House race and Westbrooks in the judicial race. Although Mississippi judicial candidates run without party labels, it is common for politicians from both parties to get involved. For example, Republican Gov.

*Phil Bryant endorsed Jack Wilson, who won a runoff Tuesday for another seat on the Court of Appeals.*⁵

In the 2012 Place 1 Central District contest, the incumbent William Waller was a Republican and ran as a Republican candidate for Governor in the 2019 Republican primary. His opponent, Earle Banks, a Democratic member of the Mississippi House of Representatives, was first elected as a Democrat on the partisan ballot in 1993 and has been reelected as a Democrat ever since then. The voting patterns in these two elections therefore match those seen in the statewide general elections, with Black voters favoring the Democrat and White voters favoring the Republican, and despite Dr. Handley's assertion to the contrary, are compatible with a partisan explanation.

F. District Performance

Beginning on page 14 of her report, Dr. Handley comments on the performance of various districts in various plans using an 'Effectiveness Score' that she calculates based on past elections. As she defines this score on page 15, the score "is simply the average vote share received by the 11 Black-preferred Black candidates across the 11 contests in each of the individual districts. This score allows me to determine how Black-preferred Black candidates are likely to fare in the proposed districts". She goes on to explain that "a score of less than .5 means that the average vote share received by the 11 Black-preferred Black candidates is less than 50% and the district is not likely to provide Black voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice". Of course, all of these Black candidates are also the Democratic candidates in those general elections. As discussed above, there is very little difference in the estimated voting patterns of either Black or White voters based on the race of the candidates. As such, Dr. Handley's 'Effectiveness Index' is simply the expected Democratic share of the general election vote in the district. Democratic majority districts will 'perform', and Republican majority districts will not.


⁵ "James Challenges Appeals Court Loss, Cites Partisan Politics." Jackson Free Press | Jackson, MS, www.jacksonfreepress.com/news/2016/dec/01/james-challenges-appeals-court-loss-cites-partisan.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

Dr. Handley's report provided analysis that showed that Black Democratic candidates draw cohesive support from Black voters, but as the analysis clearly demonstrates, so do White Democratic candidates. Likewise, Black Democratic candidates draw little support from White voters, but neither do White Democratic candidates. The high cohesion demonstrated by Black voters in these elections is not a function of Black voters coalescing around Black candidates but rather is a function of cohesive Black voter preferences for Democratic party candidates. Similarly, the tendency of White voters to vote cohesively against Democratic candidates is not reserved for opposition to Black Democratic candidates but is instead cohesive support for Republican candidates whether the Democratic candidate is White or Black.

I reserve the right to amend or supplement my report considering additional facts, testimony and/or materials that may come to light. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1976, I declare under penalty or perjury that foregoing is true and correct according to the best of my knowledge, information and beliefs.

October 16, 2023.


John R. Alford, Ph.D

Appendix A

John R. Alford

Curriculum Vitae

September 2023

Dept. of Political Science
Rice University - MS-24
P.O. Box 1892
Houston, Texas 77251-1892
713-348-3364
jra@rice.edu

Employment:

Professor, Rice University, 2015 to present.
Associate Professor, Rice University, 1985-2015.
Assistant Professor, University of Georgia, 1981-1985.
Instructor, Oakland University, 1980-1981.
Teaching-Research Fellow, University of Iowa, 1977-1980.
Research Associate, Institute for Urban Studies, Houston, Texas, 1976-1977.

Education:

Ph.D., University of Iowa, Political Science, 1981.
M.A., University of Iowa, Political Science, 1980.
M.P.A., University of Houston, Public Administration, 1977.
B.S., University of Houston, Political Science, 1975.

Books:

Predisposed: Liberals, Conservatives, and the Biology of Political Differences. New York: Routledge, 2013. Co-authors, John R. Hibbing and Kevin B. Smith. (2nd Edition under contract)

Articles:

“Political Orientations Vary with Detection of Androstenone,” with Amanda Friesen, Michael Gruszczynski, and Kevin B. Smith. **Politics and the Life Sciences.** (Spring, 2020).

“Intuitive ethics and political orientations: Testing moral foundations as a theory of political ideology.” with Kevin Smith, John Hibbing, Nicholas Martin, and Peter Hatemi. **American Journal of Political Science.** (April, 2017).

“The Genetic and Environmental Foundations of Political, Psychological, Social, and Economic Behaviors: A Panel Study of Twins and Families.” with Peter Hatemi, Kevin Smith, and John Hibbing. **Twin Research and Human Genetics.** (May, 2015.)

“Liberals and conservatives: Non-convertible currencies.” with John R. Hibbing and Kevin B. Smith. **Behavioral and Brain Sciences** (January, 2015).

“Non-Political Images Evoke Neural Predictors Of Political Ideology.” with Woo-Young Ahn, Kenneth T. Kishida, Xiaosi Gu, Terry Lohrenz, Ann Harvey, Kevin Smith, Gideon Yaffe, John Hibbing, Peter Dayan, P. Read Montague. **Current Biology.** (November, 2014).

"Cortisol and Politics: Variance in Voting Behavior is Predicted by Baseline Cortisol Levels." with Jeffrey French, Kevin Smith, Adam Guck, Andrew Birnie, and John Hibbing. **Physiology & Behavior**. (June, 2014).

"Differences in Negativity Bias Underlie Variations in Political Ideology." with Kevin B. Smith and John R. Hibbing. **Behavioral and Brain Sciences**. (June, 2014).

"Negativity bias and political preferences: A response to commentators Response." with Kevin B. Smith and John R. Hibbing. **Behavioral and Brain Sciences**. (June, 2014).

"Genetic and Environmental Transmission of Political Orientations." with Carolyn L. Funk, Matthew Hibbing, Kevin B. Smith, Nicholas R. Eaton, Robert F. Krueger, Lindon J. Eaves, John R. Hibbing. **Political Psychology**, (December, 2013).

"Biology, Ideology, and Epistemology: How Do We Know Political Attitudes Are Inherited and Why Should We Care?" with Kevin Smith, Peter K. Hatemi, Lindon J. Eaves, Carolyn Funk, and John R. Hibbing. **American Journal of Political Science**. (January, 2012)

"Disgust Sensitivity and the Neurophysiology of Left-Right Political Orientations." with Kevin Smith, John Hibbing, Douglas Oxley, and Matthew Hibbing, **PlosONE**, (October, 2011).

"Linking Genetics and Political Attitudes: Re-Conceptualizing Political Ideology." with Kevin Smith, John Hibbing, Douglas Oxley, and Matthew Hibbing, **Political Psychology**, (June, 2011).

"The Politics of Mate Choice." with Peter Hatemi, John R. Hibbing, Nicholas Martin and Lindon Eaves, **Journal of Politics**, (March, 2011).

"Not by Twins Alone: Using the Extended Twin Family Design to Investigate the Genetic Basis of Political Beliefs" with Peter Hatemi, John Hibbing, Sarah Medland, Matthew Keller, Kevin Smith, Nicholas Martin, and Lindon Eaves, **American Journal of Political Science**, (July, 2010).

"The Ultimate Source of Political Opinions: Genes and the Environment" with John R. Hibbing in **Understanding Public Opinion**, 3rd Edition eds. Barbara Norrander and Clyde Wilcox, Washington D.C.: CQ Press, (2010).

"Is There a 'Party' in your Genes" with Peter Hatemi, John R. Hibbing, Nicholas Martin and Lindon Eaves, **Political Research Quarterly**, (September, 2009).

"Twin Studies, Molecular Genetics, Politics, and Tolerance: A Response to Beckwith and Morris" with John R. Hibbing and Cary Funk, **Perspectives on Politics**, (December, 2008). This is a solicited response to a critique of our 2005 APSR article "Are Political Orientations Genetically Transmitted?"

"Political Attitudes Vary with Physiological Traits" with Douglas R. Oxley, Kevin B. Smith, Matthew V. Hibbing, Jennifer L. Miller, Mario Scalora, Peter K. Hatemi, and John R. Hibbing, **Science**, (September 19, 2008).

"The New Empirical Biopolitics" with John R. Hibbing, **Annual Review of Political Science**, (June, 2008).

"Beyond Liberals and Conservatives to Political Genotypes and Phenotypes" with John R. Hibbing and Cary Funk, **Perspectives on Politics**, (June, 2008). This is a solicited response to a critique of our 2005 APSR article "Are Political Orientations Genetically Transmitted?"

"Personal, Interpersonal, and Political Temperaments" with John R. Hibbing, **Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science**, (November, 2007).

"Is Politics in our Genes?" with John R. Hibbing, **Tidsskriftet Politik**, (February, 2007).

"Biology and Rational Choice" with John R. Hibbing, **The Political Economist**, (Fall, 2005)

"Are Political Orientations Genetically Transmitted?" with John R. Hibbing and Carolyn Funk, **American Political Science Review**, (May, 2005). (The main findings table from this article has been reprinted in two college level text books - Psychology, 9th ed. and Invitation to Psychology 4th ed. both by Wade and Tavis, Prentice Hall, 2007).

"The Origin of Politics: An Evolutionary Theory of Political Behavior" with John R. Hibbing, **Perspectives on Politics**, (December, 2004).

"Accepting Authoritative Decisions: Humans as Wary Cooperators" with John R. Hibbing, **American Journal of Political Science**, (January, 2004).

"Electoral Convergence of the Two Houses of Congress" with John R. Hibbing, in **The Exceptional Senate**, ed. Bruce Oppenheimer, Columbus: Ohio State University Press, (2002).

"We're All in this Together: The Decline of Trust in Government, 1958-1996." in **What is it About Government that Americans Dislike?**, eds. John Hibbing and Beth Theiss-Morse, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (2001).

"The 2000 Census and the New Redistricting," **Texas State Bar Association School Law Section Newsletter**, (July, 2000).

"Overdraft: The Political Cost of Congressional Malfeasance" with Holly Teeters, Dan Ward, and Rick Wilson, **Journal of Politics** (August, 1994).

"Personal and Partisan Advantage in U.S. Congressional Elections, 1846-1990" with David W. Brady, in **Congress Reconsidered** 5th edition, eds. Larry Dodd and Bruce Oppenheimer, CQ Press, (1993).

"The 1990 Congressional Election Results and the Fallacy that They Embodied an Anti-Incumbent Mood" with John R. Hibbing, **PS** 25 (June, 1992).

"Constituency Population and Representation in the United States Senate" with John R. Hibbing. **Legislative Studies Quarterly**, (November, 1990).

"Editors' Introduction: Electing the U.S. Senate" with Bruce I. Oppenheimer. **Legislative Studies Quarterly**, (November, 1990).

"Personal and Partisan Advantage in U.S. Congressional Elections, 1846-1990" with David W. Brady, in **Congress Reconsidered** 4th edition, eds. Larry Dodd and Bruce Oppenheimer, CQ Press, (1988). Reprinted in *The Congress of the United States, 1789-1989*, ed. Joel Silby, Carlson Publishing Inc., (1991), and in *The Quest for Office*, eds. Wayne and Wilcox, St. Martins Press, (1991).

"Can Government Regulate Fertility? An Assessment of Pro-natalist Policy in Eastern Europe" with Jerome Legge. **The Western Political Quarterly** (December, 1986).

"Partisanship and Voting" with James Campbell, Mary Munro, and Bruce Campbell, in **Research in Micropolitics. Volume 1 - Voting Behavior**. Samuel Long, ed. JAI Press, (1986).

"Economic Conditions and Individual Vote in the Federal Republic of Germany" with Jerome S. Legge. **Journal of Politics** (November, 1984).

"Television Markets and Congressional Elections" with James Campbell and Keith Henry. **Legislative Studies Quarterly** (November, 1984).

"Economic Conditions and the Forgotten Side of Congress: A Foray into U.S. Senate Elections" with John R. Hibbing. **British Journal of Political Science** (October, 1982).

"Increased Incumbency Advantage in the House" with John R. Hibbing. **Journal of Politics** (November, 1981). Reprinted in *The Congress of the United States, 1789-1989*, Carlson Publishing Inc., (1991).

"The Electoral Impact of Economic Conditions: Who is Held Responsible?" with John R. Hibbing. **American Journal of Political Science** (August, 1981).

"Comment on Increased Incumbency Advantage" with John R. Hibbing. Refereed communication: **American Political Science Review** (March, 1981).

"Can Government Regulate Safety? The Coal Mine Example" with Michael Lewis-Beck. **American Political Science Review** (September, 1980).

Awards and Honors:

CQ Press Award - 1988, honoring the outstanding paper in legislative politics presented at the 1987 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. Awarded for "The Demise of the Upper House and the Rise of the Senate: Electoral Responsiveness in the United States Senate" with John Hibbing.

Research Grants:

National Science Foundation, 2009-2011, "Identifying the Biological Influences on Political Temperaments", with John Hibbing, Kevin Smith, Kim Espy, Nicolas Martin and Read Montague. This is a collaborative project involving Rice, University of Nebraska, Baylor College of Medicine, and Queensland Institute for Medical Research.

National Science Foundation, 2007-2010, "Genes and Politics: Providing the Necessary Data", with John Hibbing, Kevin Smith, and Lindon Eaves. This is a collaborative project involving Rice, University of Nebraska, Virginia Commonwealth University, and the University of Minnesota.

National Science Foundation, 2007-2010, "Investigating the Genetic Basis of Economic Behavior", with John Hibbing and Kevin Smith. This is a collaborative project involving Rice, University of Nebraska, Virginia Commonwealth University, and the Queensland Institute of Medical Research.

Rice University Faculty Initiatives Fund, 2007-2009, "The Biological Substrates of Political Behavior". This is in assistance of a collaborative project involving Rice, Baylor College of Medicine, Queensland Institute of Medical Research, University of Nebraska, Virginia Commonwealth University, and the University of Minnesota.

National Science Foundation, 2004-2006, "Decision-Making on Behalf of Others", with John Hibbing. This is a collaborative project involving Rice and the University of Nebraska.

National Science Foundation, 2001-2002, dissertation grant for Kevin Arceneaux, "Doctoral Dissertation Research in Political Science: Voting Behavior in the Context of U.S. Federalism."

National Science Foundation, 2000-2001, dissertation grant for Stacy Ulbig, "Doctoral Dissertation Research in Political Science: Sub-national Contextual Influences on Political Trust."

National Science Foundation, 1999-2000, dissertation grant for Richard Engstrom, "Doctoral Dissertation Research in Political Science: Electoral District Structure and Political Behavior."

Rice University Research Grant, 1985, Recent Trends in British Parliamentary Elections.

Faculty Research Grants Program, University of Georgia, Summer, 1982. Impact of Media Structure on Congressional Elections, with James Campbell.

Papers Presented:

"The Physiological Basis of Political Temperaments" 6th European Consortium for Political Research General Conference, Reykjavik, Iceland (2011), with Kevin Smith, and John Hibbing.

"Identifying the Biological Influences on Political Temperaments" National Science Foundation Annual Human Social Dynamics Meeting (2010), with John Hibbing, Kimberly Espy, Nicholas Martin, Read Montague, and Kevin B. Smith.

"Political Orientations May Be Related to Detection of the Odor of Androstenone" Annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL (2010), with Kevin Smith, Amanda Balzer, Michael Gruszczynski, Carly M. Jacobs, and John Hibbing.

"Toward a Modern View of Political Man: Genetic and Environmental Transmission of Political Orientations from Attitude Intensity to Political Participation" Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC (2010), with Carolyn Funk, Kevin Smith, and John Hibbing.

"Genetic and Environmental Transmission of Political Involvement from Attitude Intensity to Political Participation" Annual meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology, San Francisco, CA (2010), with Carolyn Funk, Kevin Smith, and John Hibbing.

"Are Violations of the EEA Relevant to Political Attitudes and Behaviors?" Annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL (2010), with Kevin Smith, and John Hibbing.

"The Neural Basis of Representation" Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Toronto, Canada (2009), with John Hibbing.

"Genetic and Environmental Transmission of Value Orientations" Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Toronto, Canada (2009), with Carolyn Funk, Kevin Smith, Matthew Hibbing, Pete Hatemi, Robert Krueger, Lindon Eaves, and John Hibbing.

"The Genetic Heritability of Political Orientations: A New Twin Study of Political Attitudes" Annual Meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology, Dublin, Ireland (2009), with John Hibbing, Cary Funk, Kevin Smith, and Peter K Hatemi.

"The Heritability of Value Orientations" Annual meeting of the Behavior Genetics Association, Minneapolis, MN (2009), with Kevin Smith, John Hibbing, Carolyn Funk, Robert Krueger, Peter Hatemi, and Lindon Eaves.

"The Ick Factor: Disgust Sensitivity as a Predictor of Political Attitudes" Annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL (2009), with Kevin Smith, Douglas Oxley, Matthew Hibbing, and John Hibbing.

"The Ideological Animal: The Origins and Implications of Ideology" Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA (2008), with Kevin Smith, Matthew Hibbing, Douglas Oxley, and John Hibbing.

"The Physiological Differences of Liberals and Conservatives" Annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL (2008), with Kevin Smith, Douglas Oxley, and John Hibbing.

"Looking for Political Genes: The Influence of Serotonin on Political and Social Values" Annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL (2008), with Peter Hatemi, Sarah Medland, John Hibbing, and Nicholas Martin.

"Not by Twins Alone: Using the Extended Twin Family Design to Investigate the Genetic Basis of Political Beliefs" Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, IL (2007), with Peter Hatemi, John Hibbing, Matthew Keller, Nicholas Martin, Sarah Medland, and Lindon Eaves.

"Factorial Association: A generalization of the Fulker between-within model to the multivariate case" Annual meeting of the Behavior Genetics Association, Amsterdam, The Netherlands (2007), with Sarah Medland, Peter Hatemi, John Hibbing, William Coventry, Nicholas Martin, and Michael Neale.

"Not by Twins Alone: Using the Extended Twin Family Design to Investigate the Genetic Basis of Political Beliefs" Annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL (2007), with Peter Hatemi, John Hibbing, Nicholas Martin, and Lindon Eaves.

"Getting from Genes to Politics: The Connecting Role of Emotion-Reading Capability" Annual Meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology, Portland, OR, (2007.), with John Hibbing.

"The Neurological Basis of Representative Democracy." Hendricks Conference on Political Behavior, Lincoln, NE (2006), with John Hibbing.

"The Neural Basis of Representative Democracy" Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA (2006), with John Hibbing.

"How are Political Orientations Genetically Transmitted? A Research Agenda" Annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago Illinois (2006), with John Hibbing.

"The Politics of Mate Choice" Annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Atlanta, GA (2006), with John Hibbing.

"The Challenge Evolutionary Biology Poses for Rational Choice" Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC (2005), with John Hibbing and Kevin Smith.

"Decision Making on Behalf of Others" Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC (2005), with John Hibbing.

"The Source of Political Attitudes and Behavior: Assessing Genetic and Environmental Contributions" Annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago Illinois (2005), with John Hibbing and Carolyn Funk.

"The Source of Political Attitudes and Behavior: Assessing Genetic and Environmental Contributions" Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago Illinois (2004), with John Hibbing and Carolyn Funk.

"Accepting Authoritative Decisions: Humans as Wary Cooperators" Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois (2002), with John Hibbing

"Can We Trust the NES Trust Measure?" Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois (2001), with Stacy Ulbig.

"The Impact of Organizational Structure on the Production of Social Capital Among Group Members" Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Atlanta, Georgia (2000), with Allison Rinden.

"Isolating the Origins of Incumbency Advantage: An Analysis of House Primaries, 1956-1998" Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Atlanta, Georgia (2000), with Kevin Arceneaux.

"The Electorally Indistinct Senate," Norman Thomas Conference on Senate Exceptionalism, Vanderbilt University; Nashville, Tennessee; October (1999), with John R. Hibbing.

"Interest Group Participation and Social Capital" Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois (1999), with Allison Rinden.

"We're All in this Together: The Decline of Trust in Government, 1958-1996." The Hendricks Symposium, University of Nebraska, Lincoln. (1998)

"Constituency Population and Representation in the United States Senate," Electing the Senate; Houston, Texas; December (1989), with John R. Hibbing.

"The Disparate Electoral Security of House and Senate Incumbents," American Political Science Association Annual Meetings; Atlanta, Georgia; September (1989), with John R. Hibbing.

"Partisan and Incumbent Advantage in House Elections," Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association (1987), with David W. Brady.

"Personal and Party Advantage in U.S. House Elections, 1846-1986" with David W. Brady, 1987 Social Science History Association Meetings.

"The Demise of the Upper House and the Rise of the Senate: Electoral Responsiveness in the United States Senate" with John Hibbing, 1987 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.

"A Comparative Analysis of Economic Voting" with Jerome Legge, 1985 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.

"An Analysis of Economic Conditions and the Individual Vote in Great Britain, 1964-1979" with Jerome Legge, 1985 Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association.

"Can Government Regulate Fertility? An Assessment of Pro-natalist Policy in Eastern Europe" with Jerome Legge, 1985 Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Social Science Association.

"Economic Conditions and the Individual Vote in the Federal Republic of Germany" with Jerome S. Legge, 1984 Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association.

"The Conditions Required for Economic Issue Voting" with John R. Hibbing, 1984 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.

"Incumbency Advantage in Senate Elections," 1983 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.

"Television Markets and Congressional Elections: The Impact of Market/District Congruence" with James Campbell and Keith Henry, 1982 Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association.

"Economic Conditions and Senate Elections" with John R. Hibbing, 1982 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. "Pocketbook Voting: Economic Conditions and Individual Level Voting," 1982 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.

"Increased Incumbency Advantage in the House," with John R. Hibbing, 1981 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.

Other Conference Participation:

Roundtable Participant – Closing Round-table on Biopolitics; 2016 UC Merced Conference on Bio-Politics and Political Psychology, Merced, CA.

Roundtable Participant "Genes, Brains, and Core Political Orientations" 2008 Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Political Science Association, Las Vegas.

Roundtable Participant "Politics in the Laboratory" 2007 Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, New Orleans.

Short Course Lecturer, "What Neuroscience has to Offer Political Science" 2006 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.

Panel chair and discussant, "Neuro-scientific Advances in the Study of Political Science" 2006 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.

Presentation, "The Twin Study Approach to Assessing Genetic Influences on Political Behavior" Rice Conference on New Methods for Understanding Political Behavior, 2005.

Panel discussant, "The Political Consequences of Redistricting," 2002 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.

Panel discussant, "Race and Redistricting," 1999 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.

Invited participant, "Roundtable on Public Dissatisfaction with American Political Institutions", 1998 Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Social Science Association.

Presentation, "Redistricting in the '90s," Texas Economic and Demographic Association, 1997.

Panel chair, "Congressional Elections," 1992 Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association.

Panel discussant, "Incumbency and Congressional Elections," 1992 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.

Panel chair, "Issues in Legislative Elections," 1991 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.

Panel chair, "Economic Attitudes and Public Policy in Europe," 1990 Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association

Panel discussant, "Retrospective Voting in U.S. Elections," 1990 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.

Co-convener, with Bruce Oppenheimer, of Electing the Senate, a national conference on the NES 1988 Senate Election Study. Funded by the Rice Institute for Policy Analysis, the University of Houston Center for Public Policy, and the National Science Foundation, Houston, Texas, December, 1989.

Invited participant, Understanding Congress: A Bicentennial Research Conference, Washington, D.C., February, 1989.

Invited participant--Hendricks Symposium on the United States Senate, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska, October, 1988

Invited participant--Conference on the History of Congress, Stanford University, Stanford, California, June, 1988.

Invited participant, "Roundtable on Partisan Realignment in the 1980's", 1987 Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association.

Professional Activities:

Other Universities:

Invited Speaker, Annual Lecture, Psi Kappa -the Psychology Club at Houston Community College, 2018.

Invited Speaker, Annual Allman Family Lecture, Dedman College Interdisciplinary Institute, Southern Methodist University, 2016.

Invited Speaker, Annual Lecture, Psi Sigma Alpha – Political Science Dept., Oklahoma State University, 2015.

Invited Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Vanderbilt University, 2014.

Invited Speaker, Annual Lecture, Psi Kappa -the Psychology Club at Houston Community College, 2014.

Invited Speaker, Graduate Student Colloquium, Department of Political Science, University of New Mexico, 2013.

Invited Keynote Speaker, Political Science Alumni Evening, University of Houston, 2013.

Invited Lecturer, Biology and Politics Masters Seminar (John Geer and David Bader), Department of Political Science and Biology Department, Vanderbilt University, 2010.

Invited Lecturer, Biology and Politics Senior Seminar (John Geer and David Bader), Department of Political Science and Biology Department, Vanderbilt University, 2008.

Visiting Fellow, the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, 2007.

Invited Speaker, Joint Political Psychology Graduate Seminar, University of Minnesota, 2007.

Invited Speaker, Department of Political Science, Vanderbilt University, 2006.

Member:

Editorial Board, Journal of Politics, 2007-2008.

Planning Committee for the National Election Studies' Senate Election Study, 1990-92.

Nominations Committee, Social Science History Association, 1988

Reviewer for:

American Journal of Political Science

American Political Science Review

American Politics Research

American Politics Quarterly

American Psychologist

American Sociological Review

Canadian Journal of Political Science

Comparative Politics

Electoral Studies

Evolution and Human Behavior

International Studies Quarterly

[10]

Journal of Politics
Journal of Urban Affairs
Legislative Studies Quarterly
National Science Foundation
PLoS ONE
Policy Studies Review
Political Behavior
Political Communication
Political Psychology
Political Research Quarterly
Public Opinion Quarterly
Science
Security Studies
Social Forces
Social Science Quarterly
Western Political Quarterly

University Service:

Member, University Senate, 2021-2023.

Member, University Parking Committee, 2016-2022.

Member, University Benefits Committee, 2013-2016.

Internship Director for the Department of Political Science, 2004-2018.

Member, University Council, 2012-2013.

Invited Speaker, Rice Classroom Connect, 2016.

Invited Speaker, Glasscock School, 2016.

Invited Speaker, Rice Alumni Association, Austin, 2016.

Invited Speaker, Rice Alumni Association, New York City, 2016.

Invited Speaker, Rice TEDxRiceU , 2013.

Invited Speaker, Rice Alumni Association, Atlanta, 2011.

Lecturer, Advanced Topics in AP Psychology, Rice University AP Summer Institute, 2009.

Scientia Lecture Series: "Politics in Our Genes: The Biology of Ideology" 2008

Invited Speaker, Rice Alumni Association, Seattle, San Francisco and Los Angeles, 2008.

Invited Speaker, Rice Alumni Association, Austin, Chicago and Washington, DC, 2006.

Invited Speaker, Rice Alumni Association, Dallas and New York, 2005.

[11]

Director: Rice University Behavioral Research Lab and Social Science Computing Lab, 2005-2006.

University Official Representative to the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, 1989-2012.

Director: Rice University Social Science Computing Lab, 1989-2004.

Member, Rice University Information Technology Access and Security Committee, 2001-2002

Rice University Committee on Computers, Member, 1988-1992, 1995-1996; Chair, 1996-1998, Co-chair, 1999.

Acting Chairman, Rice Institute for Policy Analysis, 1991-1992.

Divisional Member of the John W. Gardner Dissertation Award Selection Committee, 1998

Social Science Representative to the Educational Sub-committee of the Computer Planning Committee, 1989-1990.

Director of Graduate Admissions, Department of Political Science, Rice University, 1986-1988.

Co-director, Mellon Workshop: Southern Politics, May, 1988.

Guest Lecturer, Mellon Workshop: The U.S. Congress in Historical Perspective, May, 1987 and 1988.

Faculty Associate, Hanszen College, Rice University, 1987-1990.

Director, Political Data Analysis Center, University of Georgia, 1982-1985.

External Consulting:

Expert Witness, Shafer et al v. Pearland ISD, racially polarized voting analysis, 2023.

Expert Witness, Nairne et al v. Ardoin, (Louisiana) racially polarized voting analysis, 2023.

Expert Witness, Petteway v. Galveston County, racially polarized voting analysis, 2023.

Expert Witness, Dixon v. Lewisville ISD, racially polarized voting analysis, 2022.

Expert Witness, Soto Palmer v. Hobbs, (Washington State), racially polarized voting analysis, 2022.

Expert Witness, Pendergrass v. Raffensperger, (Georgia State House and Senate), racially polarized voting analysis, 2022.

Expert Witness, IULAC, et al. v. Abbott, et al., Voto Latino, et al. v. Scott, et al., Mexican American Legislative Caucus, et al. v. Texas, et al., Texas NAACP v. Abbott, et al., Fair Maps Texas, et al. v. Abbott, et al., US v. Texas, et al. (consolidated cases) challenges to Texas Congressional, State Senate, State House, and State Board of Education districting, 2022.

Expert Witness, Robinson/Galmon v. Ardoin, (Louisiana), racially polarized voting analysis, 2022.

Expert Witness, Christian Ministerial Alliance et al v. Arkansas, racially polarized voting analysis, 2022.

Expert Witness, Johnson v. Wisconsin Elections Commission, 2022.

Expert Witness, Rivera, et al. v. Schwab, Alonzo, et al. v. Schwab, Frick, et al. v. Schwab, (consolidated cases) challenge to Kansas congressional map, 2022.

Expert Witness, Grant v. Raffensperger, challenge to Georgia congressional map, 2022

Expert Witness, Brooks et al. v. Abbot, challenge to State Senate District 10, 2022.

Expert Witness, Elizondo v. Spring Branch ISD, 2022.

Expert Witness, Portugal v. Franklin County, et al., challenge to Franklin County, Washington at large County Commissioner's election system, 2022.

Consulting Expert, Gressman Math/Science Petitioners, Pennsylvania Congressional redistricting, 2022.

Consultant, Houston Community College – evaluation of election impact for redrawing of college board election districts, 2022.

Consultant, Lone Star College – evaluation of election impact for redrawing of college board election districts, 2022.

Consultant, Killeen ISD – evaluation of election impact for redrawing of school board election districts, 2022.

Consultant, Houston ISD – evaluation of election impact for redrawing of school board election districts, 2022.

Consultant, Brazosport ISD – evaluation of election impact for redrawing of school board election districts, 2022.

Consultant, Dallas ISD – evaluation of election impact for redrawing of school board election districts, 2022.

Consultant, Lancaster ISD – redrawing of all school board member election districts including demographic analysis and redrawing of election districts, 2021.

Consultant, City of Baytown – redrawing of all city council member election districts including demographic analysis and redrawing of election districts, 2021.

Consultant, Goose Creek ISD – redrawing of all board member election districts including demographic analysis and redrawing of election districts, 2021.

Expert Witness, Bruni et al. v. State of Texas, straight ticket voting analysis, 2020.

Consulting Expert, Sarasota County, VRA challenge to district map, 2020.

Expert Witness, Kumar v. Frisco ISD, TX, racially polarized voting analysis, 2019.

Expert Witness, Vaughan v. Lewisville ISD, TX, racially polarized voting analysis, 2019.

Expert Witness, Johnson v. Ardoin, (Louisiana), racially polarized voting analysis, 2019.

Expert Witness, Flores et al. v. Town of Islip, NY, racially polarized voting analysis, 2018.

Expert Witness, *Tyson v. Richardson ISD*, racially polarized voting analysis, 2018.

Expert Witness, *Dwight v. State of Georgia*, racially polarized voting analysis, 2018.

Expert Witness, *NAACP v. East Ramapo Central School District*, racially polarized voting analysis, 2018.

Expert Witness, *Georgia NAACP v. State of Georgia*, racially polarized voting analysis, 2018.